



*Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995)(*en banc*); and *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

The complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted” or is “frivolous or malicious.” 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 31. Hence, under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989).

This court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5 (1980)(*per curiam*). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* petition is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded *pro se* pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to “conjure up questions never squarely presented” to the court. *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985). The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Department of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990).

In order for this Court to hear or decide a case, the Court must first have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the litigation. It is well established that federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They possess only that power authorized by the Constitution and federal statute. See *Willy v. Coastal Corp.*, 503 U.S. 131, 136-37 (1992); *Bender v. Williamsport Area School District*, 475 U.S. 534, 541 (1986). This limited jurisdiction is not to be expanded by judicial decree. See *American Fire & Casualty Co. v. Finn*, 341 U.S. 6 (1951). It is to be presumed that a cause lies outside this limited jurisdiction, see *Turner v. Bank of North America*, 4 U.S. (4 Dall.) 8, 11 (1799), and the burden of establishing the contrary rests upon the party asserting jurisdiction, see *McNutt v. General Motors Acceptance Corp.*, 298 U.S. 178, 182-83 (1936).

The two most commonly recognized and utilized bases for federal court jurisdiction are (1) “federal question,” 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and (2) “diversity of citizenship.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332. The allegations contained in the complaint filed by the plaintiff in the above-captioned matter do not fall within the scope of either form of this Court’s limited jurisdiction.

First, there is clearly no basis for a finding of diversity jurisdiction over this complaint. The diversity statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), requires complete diversity of parties and an amount in controversy in excess of seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000.00):

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between—

(1) citizens of different States[.]

28 U.S.C. § 1332.

Any state law causes of action, to the extent any are presented, would be cognizable in this court under the diversity statute, *Cianbro Corporation v. Jeffcoat and Martin*, 804

F. Supp. 784, 788-791 (D.S.C. 1992), *affirmed*, *Cianbro Corporation v. Jeffcoat and Martin*, (4th Cir., November 22, 1993), 10 F.3d 806 [Table], if that statute's requirements are satisfied. Complete diversity of parties in a case means that no party on one side may be a citizen of the same State as any party on the other side. See *Owen Equipment & Erection Co. v. Kroger*, 437 U.S. 365, 372-374 (1978). This court has no diversity jurisdiction because all parties in the above-captioned case are residents of the State of South Carolina. Hence, complete diversity of parties is absent in the above-captioned case, and diversity jurisdiction is, therefore, lacking.

Second, it is clear that the essential allegations of the complaint are insufficient to show that the case is one "arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 1331. That is, the complaint does not state a claim cognizable under this Court's "federal question" jurisdiction. It is well settled that "the use of vile and abusive language is never a basis for a civil rights action." *Grandstaff v. City of Borger*, 767 F.2d 161 (5th Cir. 1985) (there is no federal constitutional right to be free from emotional distress, psychological stress, or mental anguish, and, hence, there is no liability under § 1983 regarding such claims). While the alleged statements, if made, might be construed as inappropriate, mere threats or verbal abuse, without more, does not state a cognizable claim under § 1983. See *Northington v. Jackson*, 973 F.2d 1518, 1524 (10th Cir. 1992) (citing *Collins v. Cundy*, 603 F.2d 825, 827 (10th Cir. 1979)); see also *Carter v. Morris*, 164 F.3d 215, 219 n.3 (4th Cir. 1999)(racial epithets, while deplorable and unprofessional, do not rise to the level of a Constitutional violation).

Additionally, the plaintiff cannot recover damages for "punitive, emotional, mental" distress. See *Grandstaff*, 767 F.2d 161 (there is no federal constitutional right to be free

from emotional distress, psychological stress, or mental anguish, and, hence, there is no liability under § 1983 regarding such claims); *Zehner v. Trigg*, 952 F.Supp. 1318, 1322-23 (S.D. Ind. 1997)(exposure to asbestos not “physical injury” necessary to support claim for mental or emotional injury under PLRA); and 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(e) (“No Federal civil action may be brought by a prisoner confined in a jail, prison, or other correctional facility, for mental or emotional injury suffered while in custody without a prior showing of physical injury.”).

As for the fact that Plaintiff was placed in a 5x5 cell, Federal Courts are required to accord great consideration to a correctional system’s need to maintain order, discipline, and control. *Wolff v. McDonell*, 418 U.S. 539, 558-562 (1974). There is no constitutional right for a state or federal prisoner to be housed in a particular institution, at a particular custody level, or in a particular portion or unit of a correctional institution. See *Olim v. Wakinekona*, 461 U.S. 238 (1983), and *Ange v. Paderick*, 521 F.2d 1066 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1975). Thus, the placement and assignment of inmates into particular institutions or units by state or federal corrections departments are discretionary functions and are not subject to review *unless* state or federal law places limitations on official discretion. *Hayes v. Thompson*, 726 F.2d 1015, 1016-1017 & n.1 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984)(collecting cases).

In fact, it is well settled that the placement of inmates into administrative segregation units is a valid means of minimizing a "threat to security of the institution, threat to the safety of other residents or Jail staff, etc." *Jackson v. Bostick*, 760 F. Supp. 524, 528 (D.Md. 1991). See also *Hewitt v. Helms*, 459 U.S. 460, 468 (1983)("[T]he transfer of an inmate to less amenable and more restrictive quarters for nonpunitive reasons is well within the terms of confinement ordinarily contemplated by a prison sentence."); *Anderson v. County of*

*Kern*, 45 F.3d 1310, 1316 (9th Cir. 1995)(prison officials have legitimate penological interest in administrative segregation, and they must be given "wide-ranging deference" with respect to their need to maintain order, discipline, and "institutional security"); and *Montanye v. Haymes*, 427 U.S. 236, 242 (1976)(if a prisoner's confinement is within terms of the sentence imposed upon him and does not violate other constitutional provisions, "the Due Process Clause does not in itself subject an inmate's treatment by prison authorities to judicial oversight").

Finally, Plaintiff has not requested any injunctive relief or compensatory or monetary damages in the relief portion of his Complaint. Since no appropriate request for relief has been made, it is appropriate to recommend dismissal of this case. *Dupree v. Lubbock County Jail*, 805 F. Supp. 20, 21 (N.D. Tex. 1992)(action dismissed for failure to state a claim because no demand for judgement set forth in complaint); *Montgomery-Seth v. Bureau of Prisons*, No. 07-49, 2007 WL 710162 (E.D. Ken. March 7, 2007)(holding that failure to demand any form of relief justifies dismissal); *Player v. Phoenix*, No. 92-401, 1992 WL 350780, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 13, 1992)(action dismissed for failure to state claim due to the lack of demand for judgement in the amended complaint).

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the complaint in the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process.

March 14, 2011  
Greenville, South Carolina

s/Kevin F. McDonald  
United States Magistrate Judge

**The plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.**

### **Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
Room 239  
300 East Washington St.  
Greenville, South Carolina 29601

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).